DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 444 EA 015 866

AUTHOR Goodman, Norman G.
TITLE The International Institutionalization of Education.
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society (27th, Atlanta, GA, March 16-19, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Differences; *Degrees (Academic); *Developed Nations; *Developing Nations; Educational Theories; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Qualifications; Social Influences; *Social Status; Sociocultural Patterns
IDENTIFIERS *Malaysia

ABSTRACT

A study of student opinions in a developing country--Malaysia--shows that the institutionalization of education in developed countries has been transferred to developing countries in the status given to Western degrees. Ideas about what constitutes knowledge and professionalism, disseminated by universities of the Western world, have come to dominate higher education in developing countries; however, the importance of a Western-style education for institutionalizing its values lies in the way such a curriculum shapes a nation's view of its own development, its schooling systems, its other institutions, and its powerful class. Western-style theories of knowledge prescribe kinds of analysis and solutions to Third-World problems, just as theories of competency (based upon degrees held or programs completed) prescribe who is to be given elite status in a specialized field and in the social structure as a whole. In developing countries, then, degrees from universities in developed countries might seem to be valued highest. To test this hypothesis about high-status degrees in a developing nation, a questionnaire, which compared the status of degrees from five countries (Britain, the United States, Malaysia, India, and the Philippines), was given to a group of secondary-level students from Malaysia. Results indicate much higher status accorded degrees from developed countries than even to Western-style universities in the Third World. (JW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED233444

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Norman G. Goodman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF EDUCATION

Norman G. Goodman
Office of International Education
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

A Paper Presented to
The Comparative and International Education Society
Annual Confernce, March 16-19, 1983
Atlanta, Georgia

EA 015 866

Introduction

Arnove (1980) has suggested that it is no longer sufficient to examine education solely within the context of the nation-state. It is necessary to recognize that national education systems are greatly conditioned by the international environment, just as the societies in which the education systems reside are affected by the complex set of relationships existing among nations. Arnove calls for a new emphasis on world systems analysis which will examine education within this larger international perspective. In this paper, we will concentrate on education as an internationally institutionalized ideological structure, largely defined by Western society. We will specifically explore how this institutionalization of education may operate in the context of overseas education. (1) An analysis of the international institutionalization of education adds a new dimension to the way overseas education is conventionally viewed in development and dependency theories. Some empirical results from research done in Malaysia will be presented to support the analysis presented. (2)

The Institutionalization of Education

In this paper, we will refer to institutionalization in the sense that ideas become accepted within society as definitional for the conduct of daily life. These ideas become relatively fixed and assumed within society, i.e. they become the social construction of reality. (Berger and Luckman, 1975)

A great deal of research in education focuses on the direct

socialization characteristics of formal and nonformal education. For example, the research examines the role of the teacher or the type of curriculum, the structure of the classroom or the method of instruction as it directly affects students and their learning. However, education as a structure and system within society may have a broader, more generalized impact on society than shaping students in classrooms.

Education as Theories of Knowledge and Personnel

Meyer (1977) has persuasively argued that aside from whatever direct socialization properties it has, education also institutionalizes and legitimates theories of knowledge and theories of personnel for society as a whole. Education institutionalizes a normative order which legitimizes other modern institutions and leads individuals to advocate and support them. According to Meyer, modern educational systems replace traditional, sacred, and primordial explanations for the nature and organization of personnel and knowledge. Education defines and legitimates certain types of knowledge as extant and as authoritative. For example, medical science is defined by and gains legitimacy from medical schools. Conversely, shamanism loses its authority and legitimacy as modern education expands and is institutionalized in society.

Education also defines and legitimates categories of persons who are to be treated as possessing these bodies of knowledge and forms of authority, i.e. education establishes a theory of personnel. For example, education establishes for society the

criteria and categories for deciding who possesses medical knowledge (almost regardless of whether they do or not) and thus can be recognized as doctors. In this capacity, education acts as a selector, sorter, and allocator of status. The status allocation authority of education has been widely recognized. (e.g. Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Carnoy, 1975) Empirical research by Blau and Duncan (1967), Duncan, Featherman and Duncan (1972), and Sewell and Hauser (1975) all confirm that years of education, regardless of what is learned in those years, is an important indicator of status attainment. This suggests that status is allocated on the basis of educational certification and level rather than on the particular abilities which presumably may be learned.

Elite education as a theory of knowledge has the legitimating effect of establishing the "authority of specialized competency". The specialized bodies of knoweldge defined and created by education (e.g. economics, business administration, computer science) describe ideas of social life which are made authoritative by education. These bodies of knoweldge then must be taken into account by social actors or they will appear ignorant or irrational. For example, regardless of whether economics is an effective science, politicians are compelled to consult economists because economics is supposed to be the authoritative source of knowledge on, for instance, the effcts of budget decisions.

Finally, as a theory of personnel, elite education has the legitimating effect of establishing specialized and elite

categories of people who are supposedly competent in specialized areas of knowledge as defined by education. Education not only establishes the categories, it also "consists of allocation rules and initiation ceremonies designating which persons possess the authority and competence for various elite roles." (Meyer, 1977) For example, education institutionalized in society establishes and legitimates the authority of such specialized areas as economics. It also establishes and legitimates the specialized, elite personnel category "economist", and the rules by which people can be certified to authoritatively claim to be an economist in society.

Meyer's ideas greatly expand the role of education in society and its potential for social change. Education is no longer seen simply as a device for inculcating ideas into students. It also establishes particular, modern theories of knowledge and categories of personnel for society as a whole. Imposed on a traditional society, a modern educational system would do nothing less than redefine much of social reality. Meyer and Rubinson (1975) identified several areas in which the introduction of modern education might influence a traditional society.

1. National language, history and culture are seen by all parties as institutionalized. Students may or may not learn these things but they are symbolically located in schools.

2. As positions in the modern institutional order are allocated on the basis of education rather than traditional criteria, the changed (and universalistic) norms implied by this process are affirmed in the perspective of all the parties involved.

3. The allocation of positions on the basis of (even non-sensical) educational credentials also changes the

character of the positions themselves. Professionalization, even without content is a way of defining new and modern purposes and orientations in elites.

4. Mass education in particular promotes a moral basis for the shift of authority and participation to the citizenry. Primary schools - even ineffective ones - can help to provide or support a political ideology or theory which makes it sensible to allow even illiterate peasants to take part in managing the wider society.

As these examples suggest, the institutionalization of modern education in society can have a significant effect in shaping the way people view their society and their roles in it.

Extension of Meyer in the Context of the World System

Now consider Meyer's ideas in the world system context. If we view modern education as a network of structures and a system that operates throughout the world, it is easy to see how education plays very much the same institutional role internationally as it does within one society. It not only defines and legitimates theories of knowledge and personnel nationally but also internationally. In terms of theories of knowledge, modern education in the world system institutionalizes Western science and technology as the authoritative source of knowledge for development. In terms of theories of personnel, it defines typically modern categories of work and legitimates elite status claims not just to the Western educated but <u>to those actually educated in the West.</u>

In examining education from a world system perspective, the dominance of the West in shaping modern education throughout the world has been noted by many. The dominance of the West stems

largely from the historical relationship between the Western nations and their colonies throughout the rest of the world in which Western systems of education were imposed on the colonial societies. (Carnoy, 1974; Altbach and Kelly, 1978) As we have just suggested, this would have the effect of institutionalizing modern theories of knowledge and personnel within the colonies. It also established the Western sources of these modern theories as pre-eminent and authoritative. As Kumar (1979) explains:

> The reason is simple. The lifestyles, beliefs, value systems and world views of the metropoles are generally presented as the main cause of the economic and political superiority of these (Western) nations. Thus, the masses and elites of the (developing countries) come to idealize them; they begin to accept them uncritically and develop a feeling of inferiority about their cultural systems. In fact, their own self images are shaped by the images held by people in the metropoles. (Pg. 12, parentheses mine.)

The establishment of institutions of higher education in developing countries was merely an extension of the colonial policy of imposing center thinking on their colonies. The local universities were very closely modeled after and linked to the metropolitan "parent" university. Mazrui (1979) likened African universities to subsidiaries of cultural multinational corporations headquartered in the metropolitan centers. (also Fuenzalida, 1979b, 1980)

After the independence of most colonies, there was little change in the nature of the emerging world education system. The school systems established by the Western metropoles not only remained, in most cases, they were rapidly expanded by the newly independent governments. This expansion incorporated even greater portions of society under Western ways of defining and

understanding their own societies and relationships with the West.

While most colonial universities have attained formal autonomy, just as the colonies have gained formal political independence, they continue to reflect metropolitan university organization, methodology, and thought. They are, as Fuenzalida points out, still a part of the "cultural superstructure of the world" dominated by the developed countries. Fuenzalida (1979a) explains:

> The "cultural superstructure" is shaped and guided by the philosophical and epistemological tenets of North America and European universities, and the incorporation of universities from underdeveloped countries has the dual effect of assimilating their institutional culture to these tenets while at the same time dissociating institutions of higher education from the national context in which they were established.

One explanation for the continuing close imitation of Western university structure, methods, and contents by universities in the Third World is the legitimacy and authority they gain from their resemblance to the concepts of knowledge institutionalized throughout the world by Western universities. Western education systems and structures define the structures and systems of education for the rest of the world and by extension, they define what is knowledge and who can claim competence in it.

Theories of Knowledge and The International Institutionalization of Education

Given Western dominance in the international institutionalization of education, the theories of knowledge which are established as authoritative are those found primarily

in the West. As Kumar suggested, the theories of knowledge established in the West represent development knowledge for the rest of the world, the knowledge supposedly necessary to achieve standards of living comparable to the Western countries. Given the authority of Western knowledge for development, there is a ready explanation for the "underdevelopment" of the Third World, they do not possess the knowledge and they must get it before they can move up the development ladder.

Development knowledge emphasizes modern scientific and technological approaches to questions. Specialized fields of development knowledge have been created in Western universities including such subjects as development economics, international development education, rural sociology, development communications, and most recently farming systems research. These and other such academic fields constantly produce new "truths" about the processes of development and new strategies to speed the process of modernization. Frequently, the knowledge produced in Western universities conflicts with earlier knowledge. For example, over the past twenty-five years, development knowledge from these universities has prescribed such completely divergent development theories as the "trickle down" approach to the "basic needs" or "bottom-up" approach. As these theories have gained currency in Western academic circles, they gain authority and legitimacy throughout the world, and they have become the new policies for development in the Third World. What is important to observe in this process is the extraordinary influence Western education has for defining the conditions,

problems, and solutions of the developing world almost regardless of the accuracy or validity of its analyses, or the relevance of its solutions. This reflects the powerful international institutionalization of modern education and the theories of knowledge it establishes.

Theories of Personnel and the International Institutionalization of Education

Theories of personnel are also internationally institutionalized by education. They establish categories of personnel who possess competence in development knowledge and certification procedures to identify individuals who can claim competence in the specialized bodies of knowledge. These theories of personnel inform and explain to the home society who is entitled to be allocated elite status on the basis of their (supposed) competence in a specialized body of knowledge.

R.P. Dore (1976) has described what he refers to as the "diploma disease" which has struck the developing world. It is a clamoring for Bachelor degrees and higher degrees from Western-style universities throughout the developing world. This intense demand for higher education degrees is explained by the perception of parents, students, the government, and modern sector employers that the appropriate qualifications for high status roles in their developing societies is through the acquisition of degree certification from universities.

However, beyond home universities and home degrees in the developing world, there is also overseas higher education in the Western countries. Overseas higher education from Western

countries establishes a whole additional and more elite category of personnel in developing societies. The overseas educated person has had more direct access and exposure to the dominant and authoritative knowledge of the West. Given the dominant status of Western knowledge and its locus in Western universities, developing country universities are viewed as second best imitations of Western universities and their degrees lack legitimacy and authority compared to overseas degrees even in identical fields of study.

The establishment of the idea that overseas degrees indicate special competence in specialized bodies of knowledge for developing societies leads those societies to accord high status to overseas graduates. As Eide (1972) has observed:

> One remarkable fact is that a student who has been trained abroad enjoys a certain prestige and even a privileged status in his home country. This is due not only to such objective factors as his training and actual ability but also to additional subjective factors, the good reputation of the host country being transferred in some curious way to his own person. (Pg. 98)

Moreover, numerous studies of foreign graduates in developing countries confirm that Western educational certification has become an important factor in gaining access to modern elite status at home. (Useem and Useem, 1955; Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office, 1967; Gardner, 1963; Davis, 1970; Eide, 1970; Hodgkin, 1972) Ekeh (1975) writing about Africa says that foreign education particularly from a former colonial power is a valuable key to social mobility. He says it has become "part of the

anti-colonial African bourgeois ideology to show that they are as good as the colonists because they have the same qualifications."

What is interesting about the personnel definition and certification properties of Western education in the world system is that they can operate over and above whatever actual knowledge and training individuals gain from their overseas studies. They can also operate regardless of variations in the quality of overseas education individuals receive or even the actual relevance of that education for home country applications. What is important is the institutionalization of modern education in the home society; that the home society believes in the legitimacy and authority of Western education to certify individuals as competent in specialized bodies of development knowledge to fill elite modern roles.

This interpretation of the reasons for the flow of foreign students from developing countries to the West and the influence overseas education has on developing societies differs considerably from the way overseas education is viewed by development theorists or dependency theorists. Most development theorists view overseas education as a means of transferring critical development knowledge and technology from the West to the developing world. Foreign education is a process of developing essential human capital. (Bochner, 1979; Harbison and Meyers, 1964) In the development paradigm, the direct socialization and education of the foreign student is the operating mechanism for this process. It is easy to see that the development paradigm is the dominant theory operating throughout

the world as an explanation for overseas education regardless of the validity behind the assumptions it makes about such things as the relevance of overseas education, the quality of overseas education, or the effectiveness of overseas education in actually imparting the targetted information.

Dependency theorists are more sensitive to the problems of the cultural incorporation of third world countries by the dominant Western developed countries. They view the development paradigm as a Western ideological construct imposed on the rest of the world to rationalize the world economic system and to define the role of the third world in it. Overseas education is ostensibly explained as required for human capital acquisition and the transfer of technology but most dependency theorists argue that the real, underlying agenda in overseas education is the socialization of Third World students to Western ideas, values, tastes, etc. When these people return to their countries, dependency theorists argue, they identify more with the West than with their own cultures and they tend to work toward the re-organization of their societies around Western ideas. (Alatas, 1975; Sauvant, 1976; Fuenzalida, 1979b) Alatas describes individuals in developing countries whose thinking has been shaped by higher education abroad (or by Western dominated institutions at home) as having "captive minds".

> A captive mind is the product of higher institutions of learning, either at home or abroad, whose way of thinking is dominated by Western thought in an imitative and uncritical manner... It is alienated from its own national tradition, if it exists, in the field of its intellectual pursuit. It is unconscious of its own captivity and the conditioning factors making it what it is ... It is a result of the Western dominance over the

rest of the world.

As in the development paradigm, the operation of overseas education lies in its direct socialization and education of the overseas student. While it does not make the same assumptions about the relevance or quality of overseas education, dependency theory does assume that Western education is particularly effective in inculcating Western ideas, values, and so on.

In fact, there is probably some validity to both points of view. We are not interested in disputing these perspectives. However, the institutionalization of education adds a whole new dimension to the discussion. The operational element in overseas education is not the socialization or education of the individual student studying abroad. Rather, the operational element is the institutionalization of modern education in society as a whole because it shapes such things as the way people at home view the development of their society, the way education should be organized, how it relates to other institutions, and the way foreign graduates are to be understood and treated. We do not assume the quality or relevance of overseas education for development. It is only important that the home society believes overseas education is relevant and good. We also do not assume that the student necessarily learns either new knowledge and skills or is socialized to Western values while abroad. The important thing is that the student can claim to be certified in a specialized field by Western education. The home society will allocate high status roles to Western educated graduates if it accepts the legitimacy and authority of modern education to

define what is knowledge and who is qualified to understand and apply that knowledge.

Further Empirical Support

In order to obtain some further empirical support for our contentions regarding the worldwide institutionalization of education, research was conducted in Malaysia on Malaysian students considering study abroad. (3) Specifically, we wanted to investigate how Malaysian students perceived the status allocation authority of higher education from various different countries including the U.S., the U.K., India, the Philippines, and Malaysia. By extension, the results of such an inquiry would indicate the way higher education is viewed throughout Malaysian society.

The five countries chosen were selected because they possess several characteristics which make them valuable cases for comparison. First, Great Britain and India are major centers of Malaysian overseas studies. Secondly, India follows the British model of education as does Malaysia. On the other hand, the Philippines' educational system is modeled after the American system. All four of the countries use English as the medium of instruction so language was controlled for as an explanatory variable. The U.S. and Great Britain are considered developed countries while India and the Philippines are considered developing countries. Both India and the Philippines have extensive systems of higher education with potential at least for absorbing large numbers of Malaysian students as do the U.S. and

the U.K. Both India and the Philippines are neighbors of Malaysia and often have comparable problems in national development. The Philippines is also a member of ASEAN. Furthermore, given the proximity, lower cost of living and lower tuition fees, both India and the Philippines represent bargains in higher education for Malaysians. Malaysia has had close ties with Great Britain resulting from its colonial heritage and many Malaysians of Indian descent have ties to India. On the other hand, there are few Malaysians with personal ties to the Philippines or the U.S. Finally, the Malaysian government recognizes nearly all degrees from the U.K. and the U.S. but only some from India. It handles Philippine degrees largely on a case by case basis because there are very few Malaysians currently studying in the Philippines. (Government recognition of degrees is important for employment in the public sector but is not essential for private sector employment.)

The students were asked five questions concerning the status allocation authority of higher education from the U.S., the U.K., India, the Philippines, and Malaysia. These were:

1. What is your general opinion of the universities in the following countries?

2. How successful do you think Malaysian graduates from universities in these countries have been in achieving highly valued positions in Malaysian society?

3. When a student has a Bachelor's degree from universities in one of these countries, how confident can he or she be that he/she will become a leading member of Malaysian society?

4. How much do Malaysia's leading businesses and government institutions rely on the expertise, research, and technological advances produced in universities in the following countries?

> 5. It has been said that in some countries can pursue almost any field of study and his degree will help him get a highly valued position in Malaysia. There are other countries, however, from which only a few degrees are helpful in getting a highly valued position. For each of the following countries, please indicate how many different fields of study a person could choose from and expect to get a highly valued position in Malaysia when he or she finishes. (4)

The students rated these items on a five point scale with a sixth "I don't know" option. Their answers were summed and averaged to create a rating score for the status allocation authority of higher education from each of the five countries.

Results

Table 1 presents the mean rating of status allocation authority for the five countries.

Table 1

Mean Status Allocation Ratings for Higher Education From Five Countries

Country	Mean	SD	N
United States	4.15	.473	477
Malaysia	3.52	.644	487
Great Britain	4.19	.487	487
India	2.48	.555	348
Philippines	2.52	.650	153

The results in Table 1 show the average status allocation ratings for each of the countries including Malaysia. These

results indicate several interesting things. First, both British and American higher education are highly rated. In fact, they are rated almost equally. This is somewhat surprising given the substantial historical ties between the U.K. and Malaysia, and the fact that the majority of Malaysians studying overseas at the time of the research were in the U.K. and not in the U.S.

The second interesting observation from these results is that Malaysian higher education was rated only third and markedly lower than both British and American higher education. Moreover, there was somewhat less consensus on the status allocation authority of Malaysian higher education than for British or American higher education. (The standard deviation for the status allocation authority of Malaysian higher education was .644.) The students in this study at least, think that Malaysian higher education has less status allocation authority than higher education from either the U.S. or the U.K. (5)

The third observation that can be made from the results in Table 1 is that both the U.S. and U.K. rate more highly than India, the Philippines and Malaysia, the three developing countries. Moreover, many more students declined to even express an opinion about the status allocation authority of higher education from India or the Philippines. In fact, less than half the students gave ratings for Philippine higher education. Those who did opt to express opinions on Philippine education rated it very low. Furthermore, India which hosts approximately 6,000 Malaysian students, rated equally low with the Philippines among those who rated both countries.

Interpretations

These results lend support to our contentions regarding the international institutionalization of education. First, they indicate that Western education is highly valued (at least in one developing society) because both British and American higher education were rated very highly. One might have expected British higher education to do well given the large number of Malaysian students in the U.K. at the time of the research (approximately 16,000) but American higher education fared almost equally well. At the time of the research American higher education was not well known in Malaysia and there were just 3,000 students in the U.S. By contrast, there were about 6,000 Malaysians in India. U.S. education appears to be rated highly not so much because Malaysia had great experience with American education but because it is identified as Western and highly developed.

The results also indicate that the status allocation authority of Western education is ranked more highly than education from developing countries including Malaysia. This lends credence to the contention made earlier that Western education is perceived as dominant and that even home country education in developing societies is considered second best. Despite the fact that Indian and Malaysian education are modeled after the British system and Philippine education is modeled after the U.S. education system, they do not compete with education actually obtained in the West for their perceived

ability to allocate high status positions. The international institutionalization of modern education apparently establishes certification rules which hold that elite status is attached to those who study in the West.

If we remind ourselves that the students who rated these items were primarily Form 5 and Form 6 students, it is not difficult to generalize their beliefs to the rest of Malaysian society. In fact, their beliefs about the value of Western education are based on the impressions they have gotten from parents, teachers, friends, the media, etc. They do not have any direct experience with seeking employment nor have they yet been abroad. They are reflecting the generally held beliefs about the relationship between Western education and Malaysian society. Stated in another way, they are reflecting the international institutionalization of modern education and its theories of development knowledge and theories of personnel.

Summary/Conclusions/Implications

In this paper we have attempted to describe the international institutionalization of education and provide a small piece of evidence to support our contentions. We have taken Meyer's ideas of the institutionalization of education in one society and tried to show how they apply in the emerging world system. According to Meyer, education institutionalizes theories of knowledge and theories of personnel in society. We have argued that modern education is a worldwide phenomenon and it institutionalizes theories of knowledge and personnel on an international level.

Due primarily to historical reasons, modern education is dominated by Western higher education. Consequently, the theories of knowledge and personnel are predominantly Western. With the international institutionalization of modern (and Western) education, developing societies tend to accept Western knowledge as the most authoritative. Western definitions, concepts and formulations of the way society should be organized and developed are attributed the highest legitimacy. Moreover, the theories of personnel institutionalized by the world education system establish rules and certification procedures which accord the authority of specialized competence and legitimize claims to elite status to those educated not only in Western style universities in the developing countries but to an even greater extent those educated in the West.

The results of the research conducted in Malaysia tend to support the assertions made in this paper. The Malaysian students surveyed attributed the highest status allocation authority to Western higher education. Higher education from Malaysia was rated below both U.S. and British higher education. Higher education from India and the Philippines was rated even lower. This tends to confirm the idea that developing country education is viewed as second best relative to Western education. It also supports the contention of an international institutionalization of education.

As we have attempted to point out, this conceptualization of education does not assume the actual validity, accuracy, or relevance of the theories of knowledge or personnel which are

institutionalized. Nor do we assume, as most development and dependency theorists do, that the most important effects of education occur through direct socialization of students. Perhaps the greatest impacts of the world education system are in the theories of knowledge and personnel which it establishes for societies around the world.

Assuming the validity of the arguments presented here, there are several implications which we will only mention here. Given the dominance of Western knowledge in the international institutionalization of education, there will be a continuing reliance on both Western style training at home and Western education abroad for the developing countries. Moreover, developing countries will continue to seek Western expertise to validate and legitimize their development strategies. The current international institutionalization of education contributes to a dependency and lack of self-confidence in the developing world and this will tend to inhibit the development of local theories of society and homegrown strategies for change.

End Notes

1. In this paper overseas education will be used to refer to the flow of students from developing countries to Western countries. This flow represents the bulk of study abroad in the world. See Goodman, 1981. I.I.E. reports that 80% of the foreign students in the U.S. in 1932 were from developing countries.

2. Portions of this paper are borrowed and/or adapted from my dissertation, see Goodman, 1981.

3. The results reported here are a small part of a much larger study of Malaysian students and overseas higher education conducted in 1978-1979. For a more thorough discussion of this topic and the methodology involved in the research, see Goodman, 1981. There has been a dramatic change in the patterns of Malaysian overseas higher education since this research. The major flow of students has shifted from the U.K. to the U.S. and today, there are over 10,000 Malaysian students in the U.S. This change, however, does not alter the arguments presented here. In fact, it tends to confirm our claims.

Students surveyed were selected from among those who visited the Malaysian-American Commission for Educational Exchange and expressed an interest in studying in the U.S. This suggests a possible bias in favor of overseas education and specifically U.S. education in the students surveyed. However, our research revealed that many students eventually did not apply anywhere overseas. When their opinions were analyzed separately the results were almost identical to the entire group. Nevertheless, the group surveyed was not a representative sample of all Malaysian students and some caution should be exercised in interpreting the results.

4. These items were based on theoretical indicators of the Charter discussed by Meyer, 1970. Justifications for the operationalizations of these items are given in Goodman, 1981.

5. Given the ethnic politics of Malaysian education and society, one might expect variations in the evaluation of the status allocation authority of Malaysian higher education. In fact, when we analyzed these results by race, there were some differences. Malays rated Malaysian higher education higher than the Chinese or Indians. However, all three races rated U.S. and British education higher in status allocation authority than

References

Alatas, Syed Hussein
1972 MODERNIZATION AND SOCIAL CHANGE: STUDIES IN SOCIAL CHANGE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA. London: Angus and Robertson.

Alatas, Syed Hussein
1977 INTELLECTUALS IN DEVELOPING SOCIETIES. London: Cass.

Arnove, Robert
1980 "Comparative Education and World System Analysis," COMPARATIVE EDUCATION REVIEW 24(1):48-62

Benitez, Jose C.
1974 "Educational Institutionalization: The Effects of Elite Recruitment and Incorporation on Diffuse Socialization Outcomes." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckman
1975 THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF REALITY. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Press.

Bochner, Stephen
1979 "Cultural Diversity: Implications for Modernization and International Education." In Kumar, BONDS WITHOUT BONDAGE. Honolulu, Hawaii: University Press of Hawaii.

Blau, P.M. and O.D. Duncan
1967 THE AMERICAN OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE. New York: Wiley.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis
1976 SCHOOLING IN CAPITALIST AMERICA. New York: Basic Books.

Carnoy, Martin
1975 EDUCATION AS CULTURAL IMPERIALISM. New York: David McKay.

Dore, R.P.
1976 THE DIPLOMA DISEASE. Berkeley, Ca.:University of California Press.

Duncan, O.D., D.L. Featherman, and B. Duncan
1972 SOCIOECONOMIC BACKGROUND AND ACHIEVEMENT. New York: Seminar Press.

Ekeh, Peter P.
1975 "Colonialism and the Two Publics in Africa: A Theoretical Statement," COMPARATIVE STUDIES IN SOCIETY AND HISTORY 17(1):91-112.

Eide, Ingrid
1972 "Students as Bridges Between Cultures," KULTURA 17:95-110.

Eide, Ingrid
1970 STUDENTS AS LINKS BETWEEN CULTURES. Oslo, Norway: Universitelforlaget.

Fuenzalida, Edmundo F.
1980 "Relevance and Development Style." Paper presented for the 4th AID/NAFSA Workshop, Washington, D.C., March.

Fuenzalida, Edmundo F.
1979a "The Contribution of Higher Education to a New International Order." Unpublished paper, Stanford University.

Fuenzalida, Edmundo F.
1979b "Incorporation in the Contemporary Stage of the Modern World System: Conditions, Processes, and Mechanisms. A Theory Grounded in a Case Study of Chile." Paper presented to the Conference "Constancy and Change:The Political Economy of Global Differentiation," Program for International Political Economy Research, University of Southern California, Ojai, California, November 14-17.

Goodman, Norman G.
1981 "The Institutionalization of Foreign Education and the Effects of the Charter: A Study of Malaysian Student Attitudes and Adjustment to Overseas Educational Opportunity." Unpublished Dissertation. Stanford University.

Harbison, F.H. and C.A. Myers
1964 EDUCATION MANPOWER AND ECONOMIC GROWTH. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.

Hodgkin, Mary C.
1972 THE INNOVATORS: THE ROLE OF THE FOREIGNED TRAINED PERSONS IN S. E. ASIA. Sydney, Australia: Sydney University Press.

Joint United States Public Affairs Office
1967 RESEARCH REPORT: SURVEY OF VIETNAMESE WHO STUDIED OR RECEIVED TRAINING IN THE U.S.-PART I: CULTURAL AND MEDIA HABITS.
Saigon: JUSPAO Planning Office, July 23.

Kumar, Krishna
1979 BONDS WITHOUT BONDAGE. Honolulu, Hawaii: University Press of Hawaii.

Mazrui, Ali A.
1975 "The African University as a Multinational Corporation: Problems of Penetration and Dependency," HARVARD EDUCATION REVIEW 45(2):191-210.

Meyer, John W.
1970 "The Charter: Conditions of Diffuse Socialization in Schools," In W.R. Scott, ed., SOCIAL PROCESSES AND SOCIAL STRUCTURES. New York:Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Meyer, John W.
1977 "The Effects of Education as an Institution," AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY 83:55-77.

Meyer, John W., et al.
1977 "The World Education Revolution," SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION 50:242-258.

Meyer, John W. and Richard Rubinson
1975 "Education and Political Development." Unpublished paper, Sociology Department, Stanford University.

Sauvant, Karl P.
1976 "Socio-cultural Decolonization." Unpublished paper, Center on Transnational Corporations, United Nations, New York.

Sewell, William H. and Robert M. Hauser
1975 EDUCATION, OCCUPATION AND EARNINGS. New York: Academic Press.

Spaulding, Seth and Michael J. Flack
1976 THE WORLDS STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES. New York: Praeger.

Useem, John and Ruth Hill Useem
1955 THE WESTERN EDUCATED MAN IN INDIA. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute of International Studies in Education.

Wallerstein, Immanuel
1974 THE MODERN WORLD SYSTEM. New York: Academic Press.